

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presented herein is requested. claims 1-22 are pending in the present application. In the above amendments, claim 20 has been amended.

In the Office Action mailed June 30, 2004, the Examiner rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 and objected to claims 21 and 22.

Applicant respectfully responds to this Office Action.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lengyel. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation of, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference(s) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

The rejection contends that Lengyel teaches the claimed “communication method for animation of an object in a receiver...” In order to overcome this rejection, claim 20 has been amended to emphasize that the source vertex array and the destination vertex array are modified to create a zero-mean source vertex array and a zero-mean destination vertex array. At step 406, the matched source and destination vertex arrays are ortho-normalized to produce ortho-normalized source and destination vertex arrays. To determine the ortho-normalized source and destination vertex arrays, the source and destination vertex arrays are modified to create a zero-mean source vertex array and a zero-mean destination vertex array. (See Applicant’s Specification, p.13 l.22 - p.14 l.3.) This feature is not described in Lengyel.

Applicant thus respectfully submits that claim 20 is not rendered obvious by the Lengyel Patent. Since the Lengyel reference does not render claim 20, as amended, unpatentable, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection thereof be withdrawn by the Examiner.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 21 and 22 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. This objection has become moot since claim 20 has been amended. Applicant respectfully submits that the objection thereof be withdrawn by the Examiner.

**REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all pending claims in the application are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 8/17/2004

By: Arti A. Kane, Limited Recognition  
Arti A. Kane, Limited Recognition  
858-845-2650

QUALCOMM Incorporated  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121  
Telephone: (858) 651-4125  
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502